

**AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS**

Please amend claims 1 and 4 and add new dependent claims 5 and 6. A complete listing of the claims is set forth below.

**Claim 1** (currently amended): A jig to be in contact with cold contact tails and solder during ~~in~~-reflow soldering to effect a solder bond between the contact tails and pads of a board, wherein said jig is provided with diamond-like-carbon coating on at least a portion which is to be in contact with the solder so that the non-adhesive nature of the diamond-like carbon coating is exploited to prevent adhesion between the jig and the solder.

**Claim 2** (previously presented): The jig as set forth in claim 1 wherein said jig is provided with the diamond-like-carbon coating on the whole surface which is to be in contact with the solder.

**Claim 3** (previously presented): The jig as set forth in claim 1 wherein the diamond-like-carbon coating has a thickness of at least 1  $\mu\text{m}$ .

**Claim 4** (currently amended): A method for connecting connection members using a jig which is to be in contact with cold contact tails and solder during ~~in~~-reflow soldering to effect a solder bond between the contact tails and pads of a board, wherein the jig is provided with diamond-like-carbon coating on at least a portion which is to be in contact

with the solder so that the non-adhesive nature of the diamond-like carbon coating is exploited to prevent adhesion between the jig and the solder.

**Claim 5** (new): The method of claim 4 wherein said jig is provided with the diamond-like-carbon coating on the whole surface which is to be in contact with the solder.

**Claim 6** (new): The method of claim 4 wherein said diamond-like-carbon coating has a thickness of at least 1  $\mu\text{m}$ .

**INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

Summary of the Office Action:

Claims 1-4 were pending in the application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under Section 112 as indefinite for using the term “diamond-like coating.”

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 under Section 103 as unpatentable over Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,359,170 to Chen et al. in further view of an article by Singer.

Summary of Applicant's Response:

Applicant respectfully submits that the term “diamond-like film” is a well-defined term of art that does not render claims 1-4 indefinite.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 4 to include further limitations and added new claims 5 and 6 that depend from claim 4 and respectfully submits that claims 1-6 are patentable over the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.